

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Patrick R. Harrison,)	C/A No. 4:11-71-JFA-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
United States Attorney General; Immigration)	
and Customs Enforcement (ICE); South)	
Carolina Attorney General; City of Columbia)	
Police Department; Alvin S. Glenn Detention)	
Center; Officer V. Moorner, Police Officer,)	
City of Columbia Police Department; Officer)	
V. Jarvis, Corrections Officer, Alvin S. Glenn)	
Detention Center; Lt. Davis, Corrections)	
Officer, Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Patrick R. Harrison, is a pretrial detainee at the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center.¹ He brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), contending that the defendants have violated his constitutional rights.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action² has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may

¹ The plaintiff has filed this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

² The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

be granted and should be dismissed. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on June 15, 2011. However, the plaintiff failed to file objections and the deadline within which to do so has expired. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law and it is incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, this action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

August 16, 2011
Columbia, South Carolina



Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge